

GUNDERSON, PALMER, NELSON & ASHMORE, LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

ASSURANT BUILDING
440 MT. RUSHMORE ROAD
POST OFFICE BOX 8045
RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA 57709-8045

TELEPHONE (605) 342-1078

www.gundersonpalmer.com

ATTORNEYS LICENSED TO PRACTICE IN
SOUTH DAKOTA, NORTH DAKOTA, NEBRASKA
COLORADO, WYOMING, MONTANA & MINNESOTA

J. CRISMAN PALMER
JAMES S. NELSON
DANIEL E. ASHMORE
DONALD P. KNUDSEN
PATRICK G. GOETZINGER
TALBOT J. WIECZOREK
JENNIFER K. TRUCANO
DAVID E. LUST
THOMAS E. SIMMONS
TERRI LEE WILLIAMS

SARA FRANKENSTEIN
AMY K. KOENIG
JASON M. SMILEY
QUENTIN L. RIGGINS
JEFFREY R. CONNOLLY
REBECCA L. MANN
ANDREW J. KNUTSON
SHILOH M. MacNALLY
KYLE L. WIESE
WYNN A. GUNDERSON
Of Counsel

Writer's E-mail Address: tjw@gpnalaw.com

Writer's Fax No.: (605) 342-0480

April 26, 2011

VIA EMAIL and U.S. Mail

Darla Pollman Rogers
Riter, Rogers, Wattier & Northrup
P.O. Box 280
Pierre, SD 57501

VIA EMAIL Only

Richard D. Coit
SD Tel Coalition, Inc.
P.O. Box 57
Pierre, SD 57501

Re: In the Matter of the Petition of Cellco Partnership and its Subsidiaries and
Affiliates to Amend and Consolidate Eligible Telecommunications Carrier
Designations in the State of South Dakota and to Partially Relinquish ETC
Designation, Docket No. TC10-090

GPNA File No. 09540.0003

Dear Counsel:

This letter is a follow-up to my telephone call to Ms. Rogers yesterday. I am including Mr. Coit in this letter because issues raised by Ms. Rogers in our call yesterday concern a conference call we had last week that also included Mr. Coit and Andy Carlson.

It is my understanding that Golden West Cooperative's and South Dakota Telecommunications Association's position is, at this point, that their joint letter agreeing to provide certain information in response to contested discovery requests was conditioned on no Motion to Compel on any issues being filed. As I understand your position, Verizon must now supplement its Motions to Compel to include those responses where you offered additional information and Verizon accepted by letter of April 21, 2011.

Regarding your position, I must say that your position is contrary to my experience with meet and confer discussions. The common approach is to narrow the issues as much as possible, if not totally. This leaves open the ability then to only argue over the few questions where agreement could not be reached.

GUNDERSON, PALMER, NELSON & ASHMORE, LLP

April 26, 2011

Page - 2 -

In addition to this historical approach, I have reviewed your letter of April 20, 2011, and see nothing in the letter that conditioned it as an all or nothing approach. Because the Motions to Compel already apprised the Commission of the meet and confer and the resolution of the meet and confer, I will have to provide the Commission copies of your April 20th letter, our April 21st response and an explanation of why these items are still at issue. Prior to doing that, I am simply asking that you confirm in writing that I have accurately set forth your position in this letter. I also ask that you confirm this no later than the close of business tomorrow, Wednesday, so we can supplement our filings on Thursday.

Sincerely,



Talbot J. Wieczorek

TJW:klw

C: Clients

Andy Carlson

Kara Semmler